

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/453,568 12/02/99 SEKIYA

A HAG 114

023995  
RABIN & CHAMPAGNE, PC  
1101 14TH STREET, NW  
SUITE 500  
WASHINGTON DC 20005

TM02/1019

EXAMINER

HESS, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2167

DATE MAILED:

10/19/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/453,568

Applicant(s)

Sekiya

Examiner

Douglas Hess

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 2, 1999
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:

- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 20) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit:

1. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, part(a), the phrase "capable of creating accounting screens" is set forth in a functional language format (not positively recited). In claim 1, part (c), the phrase "calling the accounting screens" actually positively recites the accounting screens as part of the claimed invention, therefore, based on part (a), the accounting screens of part © lack antecedent basis.

5/8/11  
unclear

Claims 6-11 recite a "third step" through an "eighth step" respectively, however, all of these claims depend from claim 1. In order to have a third step (or 4th through 8 steps), a previous step must be present in the claim for clarity purposes. It appears the dependency of the claims could be changed to correct this error.

Also, the use of "the state" in claims 6, 7, and 11, is confusing language, it appears deleting the language would further clarify/simplify the claims.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit:

3. Claims 1-5 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Clancey et al.

See columns 4 and 5 along with drawing figures 1, 2, 2A, and 2B.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6, 7, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clancey et al.

Clancey et al. disclose the basic invention as claimed except for the particular generic details such as a merchandise management screen (claim 6), a customer management screen (claim 7), and the timing of the execution of the fourth step as claimed in 13 and 14.

RE claims 6 and 7, the mere claiming of a spreadsheet program regarding merchandise management (inventory) or customer management (address book) is old and well known in any business that deals with a product. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to automate the step of inventory and customer information since

Art Unit:

these steps could improve the timing and speed of the fifth step of performing predetermined computations.

RE claims 13 and 14, it would have been obvious to perform the fourth step (entering data) at both the beginning and at the end of a fiscal year, since most, if not all, have been performing computations based on a certain time period, such as a yearly basis, or a quarterly basis, and the step of automating this step which may have formerly been done by hand, would speed up the process which is purely known and an expected result from automation of what is known in the art.

6. Claim 12 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hess whose telephone number is (703) 308-3428. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 5:30 to 4:00.


Art Unit:

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski, can be reached on (703) 308-5138.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)-306-5404, or 5406.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Hess  
October 15, 2001

  
DOUGLAS HESS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
10-15-01